

REMARKS

This Amendment and Response to Final Office Action is being submitted in response to the final Office Action mailed October 29, 2007. Claims 32-59 are pending in the Application.

Claims 32-35 and 40-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwata (U.S. Pat. No. 5,687,168) in view of Davies et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,839,767), and in further view of Cortez et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,242,679).

Claims 36-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwata in view of Davies et al. and Cortez et al., and in further view of Sridhar et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 20020073226).

Claim 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwata in view of Davies et al. and Cortez et al., and in further view of Liu et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 20020097680).

Claim 46 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwata in view of Davies et al. and Cortez et al., and in further view of Gangadharan (U.S. Pub. No. 20050163123).

Claim 47 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwata in view of Davies et al. and Cortez et al., and in further view of Linzy (U.S. Pub. No. 20020019866).

Claims 48, 53, and 57-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwata in view of Cortez et al.

Claims 49 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwata in view of Cortez et al., and in further view of Hauris et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,422,883).

Claims 50-51 and 55-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwata in view of Cortez et al., and in further view of Sridhar et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 20020073226).

Claim 52 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwata in view of Cortez et al. and Sridhar et al., and in further view of Hauris et al.

Claim 59 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwata in view of Hauris et al., and in further view of Cortez et al.

Cortez et al.

Examiner has introduced new grounds of rejection under §103(a) for Claims 32 – 59 based on the Cortez et al. reference.

Applicants respectfully note that Cortez et al. has a priority date of October 28, 2002, while the present Application has a priority date of February 2, 2002, which precedes Cortez et al. by about nine months.

Accordingly, all of the §103(a) rejections based on Cortez et al. are respectfully traversed as this reference is not applicable prior art. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the various rejections under §103(a) based on combinations with Cortez et al. have been traversed, and respectfully request the withdrawal of all of these rejections.

CONCLUSION

Applicants would like to thank Examiner for the attention and consideration accorded the present Application. Should Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place the Application in condition for allowance, Examiner is encouraged to contact undersigned Counsel at the telephone number, facsimile number, address, or email address provided below. It is not believed that any fees for additional claims, extensions of time, or the like are required beyond those that may otherwise be indicated in the documents accompanying this paper. However, if such additional fees are required, Examiner is encouraged to notify undersigned Counsel at Examiner's earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 26, 2007

/s/ Christopher L. Bernard

Christopher L. Bernard
Registration No.: 48,234

Lawrence A. Baratta, Jr.
Registration No.: 59,553

Attorneys for Applicants

CLEMENTS | WALKER
1901 Roxborough Road, Suite 300
Charlotte, North Carolina 28211 USA
Telephone: 704.366.6642
Facsimile: 704.366.9744
cbernard@worldpatents.com